

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are in this case.

Claims 1 and 11-13 have been currently amended to better clarify the claimed invention in view of the art of record. Claims 2 and 3 are dependent from claim 1.

The Rejections of Record

Claims 1-3 and 11 have been “rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Heinzl et al. (U.S. Pat. 4,149,172).”

Claims 1-3 and 11-13 have been “rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Okamura et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,485,187).

Argument

Claims 1 (and hence claims 2 and 3) and 11-13 have been amended to emphasize at least the following concept:

The claimed invention includes an upstream filter directing the flow of ink from the ink tank through the supply tube and breaking up bubbles in the ink into smaller bubbles which are caught in a bubble catching section downstream of the filter to preclude delivering those bubbles to the print head.

By contrast, Heinz et al. teaches using a downstream filter (4) to trap but not pass air bubbles from the ink downstream from an air bubble receiver (5). This places a filter which can be clogged by such bubbles between the outlet of the air bubble receiver and the print head in the ink supply tube (7) for the print head (1, 2).

Heinzl et al. recognizes the potential for such clogging (blocking) of the filters at col. 4, lines 3-6.

Heinzl et al. simply fails to teach the claimed invention which eliminates the need for any filter between applicant's bubble catching section and the print head. neither does Heinzl et al. teach the use of an upstream filter to reduce bubble size in the ink flowing to the downstream bubble catching section.

In view of the foregoing there can be no anticipation by Heinzl et al. of claims 1-3 and 11-13 as currently amended. All of claims 1-13 as currently amended are respectfully submitted as being allowable over Heinzl et al.

As for Okamura et al., there is no discussion, teaching, or suggestion of bubble removal from an ink supply tube present in this reference. There is no recognition in Okamura et al. of the need for air bubble catching in the ink supply of an ink jet printer. Therefore, there can be no structure presented by Okamura et al. which is anticipatory of applicant's claimed invention. Claims 1-13, as currently amended, are clearly not anticipated by Okamura et al.

#### Conclusion

All of claims 1-13, as currently amended, having been fully distinguished over Heinzl et al. and Okamura et al., it is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-13 as currently amended as requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Terrell C. Birch (#19,382) at the

telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Terrell C. Birch

Registration No.: 19,382

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant